

LUC-420/Florkey 7-7-15-7-23

REMARKS

Initially, applicants would like to express their appreciation to Examiner Tilahun Gesesse for the courtesies extended to attorney James Milton during a telephone conversation on January 30, 2006. The telephone conversation involved a discussion of the rejection of claims 5 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). During the interview, Examiner Gesesse agreed with attorney Milton that the Chan reference fails to teach all of the limitations of applicants' claim 5.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention.

Applicants have avoided this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

As known by those of ordinary skill in the art, the term "one or more" means "at least". Applicants have amended claims 1-2 and 8-12 by changing the term "one or more" to the term "at least" where needed to clarify the meaning of the claims.

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Since claim 2-12 depend from allowable claim 1, these claims are also allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Independent claims 13 and 19 each have a limitation similar to that of independent claim 1, which was shown is allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Therefore, claims 13 and 19 are likewise allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Since claims 14-18 depend from claim 13, and claim 20 depends from claim 19, these dependent claims are also allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

LUC-420/Florkey 7-7-15-7-23

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,792,265 issued to Chan et al. on September 14, 2004.

Applicants have avoided this ground of rejection for the following reasons.

Chan does not teach applicants' independent claim 1 limitation, as amended, that now recites, "an application server component that receives one or more notifications of one or more open communication sessions from one or more first communication devices, wherein the one or more notifications are not limited to telephone numbers."

Applicants agree that Chan discloses a technique for providing a conference call for numerous individuals. However, contrary to applicants' claim 1, Chan does not teach that the one or more notifications are not limited to telephone numbers. Instead, Chan teaches that a subscriber accesses stored telephone numbers, communicates the telephone numbers to a server, and the server transmits the telephone numbers to a service node, as stated in column 5, lines 22-28.

Thus, the clear teaching of Chan is that the one or more notifications are limited to telephone numbers.

In view of the foregoing, applicants submit that Chan does not describe each and every element of claim 1, and therefore claim 1 is not anticipated by Chan. Since claims 2-12 depend from allowable claim 1, these claims are also allowable over Chan.

Independent claims 13 and 19 each have a limitation similar to that of independent claim 1, which was shown is not taught by Chan. For example, claim 13 recites, "sending one or more notifications of one or more open communication sessions to one or more communication devices, wherein the one or more notifications are not limited to telephone numbers", and claim 19 recites, "means in the one or more media for sending one or more notifications of one or more open communication sessions to one or more communication devices, wherein the one or more notifications are not limited to telephone numbers". Chan does not teach these limitations for the above-mentioned

LUC-420/Florkey 7-7-15-7-23

reasons. Therefore, claims 13 and 19 are likewise allowable over Chan. Since claims 14-18 depend from claim 13 and claim 20 depends from claim 19, these dependent claims are also allowable over Chan.

Claim Amendments

Claims 1-8, 12, 14-16 and 20 were amended to add the term "and".
Claims 15-17 were amended to add the term "further".


LUC-420/Florkey 7-7-15-7-23

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, allowance of all claims pending is respectfully requested. If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
James Milton
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 46,935

Dated: January 31, 2006

CARMEN B. PATTI & ASSOCIATES, LLC
Customer Number 47382